

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,298	09/27/2001	Dennis J. O'Rear	005950-657	5063
759	06/17/2003		•	
E. Joseph Gess BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P. P.O. Box 1404			EXAMINER	
			MCAVOY, ELLEN M	
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1764	
			DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7		Application No.	plicant(s)		
Advisory Action		09/966,298	O'REAR, DENNIS J.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Ellen M McAvoy	1764		
-	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
There final a condi	REPLY FILED 09 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE efore, further action by the applicant is required to a rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (' tion for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe hination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ivoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in		
	PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]			
a) [b) [event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). stensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe tee on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee		
37 CFF (b) abo	een filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten R 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened rive, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	d statutory period for reply originally set in	the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in		
1.	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF				
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:			
(a	a) 🔲 they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);		
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(0	they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplifying the		
(0	 they present additional claims without cancel NOTE: 	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.		
3.	Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):			
4.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment		
5.	5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:				
6.					
7.🖾	7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.				
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
	Claim(s) allowed:				
	Claim(s) objected to:				
	Claim(s) rejected: 1-12.				
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8.	The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Examiner.		
9.🛛	Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).			
10.	Other:		Ellen M. McAvoy Primary Examine		
			Art Unit: 1764		

Ĵ

The amendments to the claims have been carefully considered and they will be entered if this application is appealed. Although the Berlowitz et al references and the Wittenbrink et al reference do not disclose an Oxidator A value or an Oxidator BN value, it is still not clear that a line of distinction exists between the claimed oil compositions and the prior art compositions. The Oxidator A and BN values could be the same since the oil compositions appear to be comprised of the same components. It is not clear if all Fischer-Tropsch derived synthetic lube base oils have an Oxidator A value of less than about 1 or if only a select few of these conventional oils have such a value. It is not clear if all non-synthetic lube base oils, component (b), have an Oxidator BN value in the presence of additives (antioxidants?) of less than about 7.